

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 2 and 8 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 15 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-13 and 15-18 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,266,701 (Sridhar et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,800 (Gauvin). Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of Gauvin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,732 (Vincent et al.). Claims 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of Gauvin and further in view of Internet Protocol Specification (IPS).

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar et al. in view of Gauvin et al. Applicant has canceled claims 2 and 8 rendering these rejections moot. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of Sridhar et al. in Applicant's previously filed response. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

Gauvin et al. discloses an apparatus in a distributed computer environment that enables a client application of a mobile client processor to communicate with a server application of a server processor. The client application generates a request to communicate with the server

processor. The client processor includes transport procedures for processing the request. The procedures and the client application expect a connection to be in place between the client processor and the server processor via a selected circuit of the communications network at the time the request is made. The client processor includes an interceptor for intercepting the request and a communication manager for connecting the client processor and the server processor via the selective circuit of the network. Once the connection is established, the request is passed to the transport procedures.

Regarding claims 1, and 7, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, the Examiner asserts that Sridhar et al. discloses receiving a message transmission request from a connectionless-oriented user, the request including a stream-based message and a destination address of the stream-based message, at column 19, lines 14-17 and column 18, lines 25-31. However, these portions merely disclose that if a request to create a TCP socket is to connect a TCP socket to a remote computer, the redirector first looks up the TCP socket handle in the socket association table, and that the HTTP engine performs two functions in addition to direct translation of TCP requests into XTP requests. First, the information in multiple HTTP data streams passing between the gateway computer and a particular remote communications service server are multiplexed in an HTTP multiplexer for communication using a single XTP context. However, this is not receiving a

message transmission request at a router from a connectionless oriented user, the request including a stream-based message and a destination address of the stream-based message, as recited in the claims of the present application. The first portion cited in Sridhar et al. merely discloses details regarding a request to create a TCP socket passed to a TCP module and looking up a TCP socket handle. As the Examiner admits on page 7, first paragraph of the Office Action, TCP is a connection-oriented service. This is not receiving a message transmission request at a router from a connectionless-oriented user, the request including a stream-based message.

Further, the other cited portions of Sridhar, as noted in Applicant's previously filed response, relate to a redirector 914 sending a request to an HTTP engine 920 that, as noted in Applicant's previously filed response, all reside in a gateway computer 612. The portions do not disclose or suggest anything related to a message transmission request from a connectionless-oriented user. These portions merely relate to activities within the existing hardware structure of a gateway and do not disclose or suggest anything related to a message from a user.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that Sridhar et al. discloses determining by the router whether any one of currently existing sockets, whose file descriptors are stored in a socket management database at the router, is connected to the destination address, at column 19, lines 20-22. However, these portions merely disclose that if the TCP socket handle is not listed in the socket association table, the redirector looks up the host address in a table. As noted previously,

and admitted by the Examiner, TCP is a connection-oriented service. In contrast, the limitations and the claims of the present application relate to a destination address received in a message transmission request from a connectionless-oriented user. The portions in Sridhar et al. relate to connecting a TCP socket (i.e., connection-oriented). In contrast, limitations and the claims of the present application relate to determining whether currently existing sockets are connected to a destination address for transfer of a stream-based message from a connectionless-oriented user.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Sridhar et al. discloses sending a connection request to a connection manager at the router to be connected to a TCP layer to provide a connection-oriented service to the connectionless-oriented user, if it is determined that none of the existing sockets are connected to the destination address, at column 19, lines 36-56. However, as noted in Applicant's previously filed response, these portions merely relate to activities regarding whether or not the addressed host is an HTTP server. These portions have nothing to do with a connection manager at a router or providing a connection-oriented service to the connectionless-oriented user if it is determined that none of the existing sockets are connected to the destination address. The HTTP engine in Sridhar is not a router. The Examiner brings in Gauvin et al. and asserts that this reference discloses that a gateway and router are similar and can be used interchangeably. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine Sridhar et al. with Gauvin et al. and in essence, as the Examiner appears

to assert, changing the HTTP engine with a gateway, in an attempt to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application. As noted previously, all the activities recited in Sridhar et al. occur inside the gateway. These activities occurring inside a router still do not disclose or suggest receiving a message transmission request at a router from a connectionless-oriented user.

Moreover, none of the cited references disclose or suggest sending the message to the TCP layer if it is determined that any one of the existing sockets is connected to the destination address, without sending the connection request to the connection manager at the router, as recited in the claims of the present application.

To help the Examiner further understand the invention, the following is provided. In a connection-oriented service, communication proceeds through phases such as call establishment (call set-up), information transfer (call maintenance), and connection release (call tear-down), where connection-oriented services ensure that all data follow the same path through the network. In contrast, connectionless service relates to communication taking place without first establishing a connection and without immediate acknowledgment of receipt. Packets may take different routes and are reassembled at their destination.

According to the limitations in the claims of the present application, a message transmission request is sent from a connectionless-oriented user, a determination is made by a router whether any one of currently existing sockets is connected to the destination address, and if so, the message is sent to the TCP layer. However, if none of the existing sockets are

connected the destination address, a connection request is sent to a connection manager at the router to be connected to a TCP layer to provide a connection-oriented service to the connectionless-oriented user. None of the cited references disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 9, 10 and 11, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 7, and therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations and the combination of each of claims 1, 3, 4 and 7-11 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of Gauvin et al. and further in view of Vincent et al. Applicant submits that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1, and therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations and the combination of claim 6 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and this claim be allowed.

Claims 12, 13 and 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of Gauvin et al and further in view of IPS. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claim 15, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim. For example, as noted previously, none of the cited references disclose or suggest receiving a message transmission request containing a stream-based message from a connectionless-oriented user at a connection-oriented router. Further, none of the cited references disclose or suggest formatting a stream-based message into a connection-oriented protocol data unit including a source address of the connectionless-oriented user and the destination address, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 12, 13 and 16-18, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 7 and 15 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 12, 13 and 15-18 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/029,150**

Docket No. **K-0383**

Amdt. dated May 18, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-18 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tgjlg

Date: May 18, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-193\88643.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610